

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Docket Number (Optional)

006918.00010

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.1(a)]

on _____

Signature_____

Typed or printed name _____

Application Number

09/889,232

Filed

November 28, 2001

First Named Inventor

Heribert Lindlar et al.

Art Unit

2642

Examiner

William J. Deane Jr.

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

 applicant/inventor. assignee of record of the entire interest.
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.
(Form PTO/SB/96) attorney or agent of record.Registration number 42,402 attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.

Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____

Signature

Steve S. Chang

Typed or printed name

202-824-3000

Telephone number

June 1, 2006

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required.
Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*

*Total of 4 forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:	Atty. Docket No.:	006918.00010
Heribert Lindlar, et al.		
Serial No.:	Group Art Unit:	2642
Filed:	Examiner:	William J. Deane Jr.
For:	Confirmation No.:	9818

**APPLICANTS' STATEMENT OF REASONS IN SUPPORT OF
REQUEST FOR PRE-APPEAL REVIEW**

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Mail Stop AF

Customer Service Window

Randolph Building

401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

In response to the final Office Action mailed December 1, 2005, Applicants respectfully submit the present reasons in support of the enclosed request for pre-appeal review.

I. The Pending Claims 1-26 Are Not Indefinite

The sole rejection in the final Office Action is under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, alleging that all of claims 1-26 are indefinite because they use the term “connectors.” The application generally relates to electronic circuitry, and the specification describes a number of “pins” that “connect” various circuit elements. For example, the specification describes pins 20, 22, 24, 40, 42 and 44 (among others), and states that “[t]he pins of the interface 10 in the BB circuitry connect or are connectable to corresponding pins of the interface 10 of the RF circuitry 200.” Specification, p. 4, lines 3-4 (see also Figs. 1a, 1b). Applicants submit that no one of ordinary skill in the art would have trouble understanding what the claimed “connectors,” “first connector” and “second connector” are, and that the claims are not indefinite.

Applicants' undersigned representative engaged in a telephone interview with Examiner Deane on January 20, 2006, to explain that the claimed connectors are supported at least by the specification's description of the connecting pins. Agreement was reached that the rejection would be withdrawn if the specification was amended to note that the "connectors" can be "pins."

Applicants submitted the Amendment After Final on February 1, 2006, making no changes to the claims, and only amending one line in the specification to note that connectors may be pins in some embodiments. The Examiner issued an Advisory Action on March 8, 2006, indicating that the amendment would not be entered because it would require further consideration.

II. Conclusion

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are not indefinite, and that this rejection is in error.

Respectfully Submitted,

By: 
Steve S. Chang
Registration No. 42,402

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1001 G Street, N.W., 11th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 824-3000

Dated: June 1, 2006